REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-13 and 15 were examined by the Office, and in the final Office Action of June 23, 2008 all claims are rejected. With this response claim 1 is amended to correct informalities. Applicant respectfully requests entry and consideration of the amendment to claim 1, because the amendments are made to correct the informalities identified by the Office on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments do not require any additional search or substantive examination on the part of the Office, since the amendments are merely to place the claim in better form for examination.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Objections

In section 1, on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 1 is objected to due to informalities. Claim 1 is amended to recite "wherein the characters of said new word are selected," and "inserting, into the character subset." Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claim 1 correct the informalities identified by the Office.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 3, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Will (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,640) in view of Dostie et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2004/0021691). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. The cited references at least fail to disclose or suggest generating the character subset with the inference logic comprises identifying a start of an entry of the new word, and inserting, into the character subject, the most probable letters stored in the database of words for starting the new word, as recited in claim 1.

In contrast to amended claim 1, Dostie discloses that only once at least one character is entered using the character entry system (28) can the user use the character entry system (28) and search list (30) to rapidly and flexibly enter text. See Dostie paragraph [0079]. Furthermore, when a character is entered in Dostie the entered character is added to the trailing end of the partial text entry, and the partial text entry is used to search a dictionary of completion candidates

for a set of completion candidates that <u>begin</u> with the partial text entry entered by the user. See Dostie paragraph [0009]. Therefore, Dostie does not disclose or suggest identifying a start of an entry of a new word, but instead teaches determining entry of the first character of a word. Since the first character in Dostie has already been entered, there is no need for insertion of probable letters for starting a word, as recited in amended claim 1.

The Office asserts that Dostie discloses identifying a start of an entry of a new word, and inserting into the character subset the most probable letters stored in the database of words for starting the new word. However, Dostie at most discloses that the data entry system (26) terminates the search and prepares for a new search based on a new partial text entry after a user has selected the space bar or period. See Dostie paragraph [0181]. While Dostie discloses that the data entry system (26) is capable of identifying the start of entry of a new word, the data entry system (26) must receive the new partial text entry in order to search the dictionary (20) for completion candidates for the new partial text entry. Dostie only discloses that the data entry system (26) begins searching the dictionary (20) for completion candidates that the user may be attempting to enter <u>when</u> the user begins entering a word or character sequence. See Dostie paragraph [0082].

Claim 1 requires identification of a start of an entry of a new word, <u>and</u> inserting the most probable letters stored in the database of words for starting the new word. Therefore, as recited in claim 1, the most probable letters are inserted without entry of any characters, since the most probable letters are based on the most probable letters for starting the new word. In contrast to claim 1, Dostie only discloses that the dictionary is searched for completion candidates after the user begins entering a word or character sequence, and therefore at least some characters must be entered in Dostie before completion candidates can be provided. However, in claim 1 characters can be provided based only on the identification of the start of the entry of a new word. Therefore, for at least this reason Dostie fails to disclose or suggest that generating the character subset with the inference logic comprises identifying a start of an entry of the new word, and inserting, into the character subject, the most probable letters stored in the database of words for starting the new word. Will fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Dostie, and therefore the cited references even in combination fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Will is directed to ambiguous input to reduce the number of browsing/scrolling candidate words. This is in contrast to claim 1, in which characters are selected individually. Therefore, Will does not disclose or suggest character prediction, but merely allows selection of characters from a character group.

Independent claim 15 contains limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claim 15 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

The dependent claims depending from the independent claims discussed above are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 13 August 2008   s/Keith R. Obert/

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
      & ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955